

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To: Alan W. Young
Young Law Firm, P.C.
4370 Alpine Road, Suite 106
Portola Valley, CA 94028

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) **19 SEP 2007**

Applicant's or agent's file reference

CYBS5858CIP2-PCT

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/US06/12043

International filing date (day/month/year)

31 March 2006

Priority date (day/month/year)

29 June 2005

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC(B) - G06F 17/00 (2007.01)

USPC - 463/42

Applicant

CYBERSCAN TECHNOLOGY, INC.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3 For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220

Name and mailing address of the ISA/IUS
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/IUS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
Facsimile No. 571-273-3201

Date of completion of this opinion

03 May 2007

Authorized officer

Blaine Copenheaver

PCT Helpdesk: 571-272-4300
PCT QSP: 571-272-1774

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/US06/12043

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
- ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
- ☐ a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
- a. type of material
- ☐ a sequence listing
- ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
- b. format of material
- ☐ on paper
- ☐ in electronic form
- c. time of filing/furnishing
- ☐ contained in the international application as filed
- ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US06/12043

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	None	YES
	Claims	1-93	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	None	YES
	Claims	1-93	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-93	YES
	Claims	None	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-93 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Gatto et al.

Regarding claim 1, Gatto et al disclose a method for downloading software components to a non-PC based gaming machine over a network (Abstract, paragraphs 7 and 13), the non-PC based gaming machine including a locked enclosure and persistent storage (paragraph 58); the method comprising the steps of: providing a PC within the locked enclosure of the non-PC gaming machine (paragraph 132); the PC including local storage; connecting the PC to the network; providing an interface between the PC and the non-PC based gaming machine; sending directly, from another gaming machine coupled to the network (Fig. 13), a package authenticated (paragraphs 65 and 68) by code signing only to the PC over the network, the package including the software components to be installed on the non-PC gaming machine (paragraph 14); verifying the code signing and unpacking the software components included in the package (Fig. 8), and enabling the non-PC based gaming machine to execute the unpacked software components (Fig. 8). Note that code signing usually employs a virtual machine to process code signing (See Yach et al, abstract).

Regarding claim 2, Gatto et al disclose the PC runs a version of the Microsoft Windows™ operating system (paragraph 13).

Regarding claim 3, Gatto et al disclose the non-PC is a PC hardware not running a version of the Microsoft Windows® operating system (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 4, Gatto et al disclose the software components are authorized by a regulatory authority (paragraphs 122, 129).

Regarding claim 5, Gatto et al disclose the sending step uses a network file copy (Figs. 8, 10, and 13).

Regarding claim 6, Gatto et al disclose the package is a Microsoft MSI package (Fig. 11).

Regarding claim 7, Gatto et al disclose the package is equivalent to a Microsoft MSI package (Fig. 12, paragraphs 14 and 15).

Regarding claim 8, Gatto et al disclose the interface includes an Application Program Interface (API) (paragraph 55).

Regarding claim 9, Gatto et al disclose the persistent storage of the non-PC gaming machine includes a disk drive or a recordable solid state memory storage (Fig. 10, paragraph 82).

Regarding claim 10, Gatto et al disclose the enabling step includes a step of storing the unpacked software components on the disk drive or the recordable solid state memory storage through the interface (Fig. 10, paragraph 82).

Regarding claim 11, Gatto et al disclose the persistent storage of the non-PC gaming machine includes a ROM (paragraphs 53, 54, 72).

Regarding claim 12, Gatto et al disclose the persistent storage of the non-PC gaming machine includes a ROM, wherein the interface includes a ROM emulator and wherein the enabling step includes sending the unpacked software components to the ROM emulator such that the non-PC based gaming machine executes the software components from the ROM emulator, bypassing the execution of the ROM software of the non-PC gaming machine (paragraph 132). It is noted that the use of a generic PC on a ROM is an emulation of a PC.

Regarding claim 13, Gatto et al disclose the verifying step includes one of issuing a verification command and a step of rebooting the PC (paragraph 60, 65, 102).

Regarding claim 14, Gatto et al disclose the step of rebooting the PC and verifying the code signing of any package stored in the PC's local memory upon reboot (paragraph 60, 65, 102).

Regarding claim 15, Gatto et al disclose a step of sending a menu of available games to the non-PC based gaming machine and wherein when a game is selected from the menu and software for the selected game is not stored in the non-PC gaming machine, the API further causes the verifying and enabling steps to be carried out on a package corresponding to the selected game (Fig. 17, paragraphs 62, 63).

(Continued in Supplemental Box)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US06/12043

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

Box V

Regarding claim 16, Gatto et al disclose a step of sending a menu of available games to the non-PC based gaming machine and wherein when a game is selected from the menu and software for the selected game is not stored in the non-PC gaming machine, the API further causes the verifying, unpacking and enabling steps to be carried out on a package corresponding to the selected game (Fig. 17, paragraphs 62, 63).

Regarding claim 17, Gatto et al disclose the package corresponding to the selected game in the verifying and enabling steps is stored in the PC's local storage (Fig. 17).

Regarding claim 18, Gatto et al disclose the package corresponding to the selected game is stored on an other gaming machine coupled to the network and wherein the package corresponding to the selected game is directly sent to the local storage of the PC from the other gaming machine prior to the verifying and enabling steps being carried out on the downloaded and stored package (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 19, Gatto et al disclose the sending step is carried-out in a peer-to-peer fashion or a daisy chain fashion package (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 20, Gatto et al disclose the verifying of the code signing is followed by aborting the method if the package code signing is invalid (Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 21, Gatto et al disclose a step of sending a selected package stored on the PC directly to the PC of another gaming machine package (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 22, Gatto et al disclose the sending is done in a peer-to-peer fashion or in a daisy-chain fashion package (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 23, Gatto et al disclose the verifying of the code signing is performed using software restriction policy or equivalent centrally federated enforcement infrastructure for enabling the execution of authorized software in network nodes using certificate rules, hash rules and/or path rules (Fig. 16).

Regarding claim 24, Gatto et al disclose the code signing uses a distinctive certificate for each package (Paragraph 48).

Regarding claim 25, Gatto et al disclose a method for ensuring that only authorized software components execute on a non-PC based gaming machine connected to a network (Abstract, paragraphs 7 and 13), the non-PC based gaming machine including a locked enclosure (paragraph 58), the method comprising the steps of: providing a PC within the locked enclosure of the non-PC gaming machine (paragraph 132); connecting the PC to the network; providing an interface between the PC and the non-PC based gaming machine (Fig. 13); packaging authorized software (paragraph 14) components that are executable to the non-PC gaming machine but not to the PC into a code signed MSI installation package (Figs. 11, 12, paragraphs 14 and 15); configuring certificate rule policies to enable execution of the code signed MSI installation package; enforcing the policies, and directly sending, from another gaming machine coupled to the network (Fig. 8), the code signed MSI installation package to the PC within the secure locked enclosure of the non-PC gaming machine, and executing the code signed MSI installation package upon startup (paragraph 15, claims 71, 73 and 75) of the non-PC based gaming machines or upon a command (paragraph 60, 65, 102).

Regarding claim 26, Gatto et al disclose the step of booting up the PC within the locked enclosure upon startup of the non-PC gaming machine (paragraph 15, claims 71, 73 and 75).

Regarding claim 27, Gatto et al disclose the code signing uses a distinctive certificate for each MSI installation package (paragraph 60, 65, 102).

Regarding claim 28, Gatto et al disclose the directly sending step is carried-out in a peer-to-peer fashion or a daisy chain fashion (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 29, Gatto et al disclose the non-PC is a PC hardware not running a version of the Microsoft Windows® operating system (paragraph 13).

Regarding claim 30, Gatto et al disclose the directly sending step uses a network file copy (Figs. 8, 10, and 13).

Regarding claim 31, Gatto et al disclose a step of sending a selected package stored on the PC directly to the PC of another gaming machine (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

(Continued in next Supplemental Box)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US06/12043

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

Previous Supplemental Box

Regarding claim 32, Gatto et al disclose the enforcing the policies is performed using software restriction policy or equivalent centrally federated enforcement infrastructure for enabling the execution of authorized software in network nodes using certificate rules, hash rules and/or path rules (Fig. 16).

Regarding claim 33, Gatto et al disclose a gaming machine (Abstract, paragraphs 7 and 13), comprising: a locked enclosure (paragraph 58); a first computing device disposed within the locked enclosure, the first computing device being configured to run a first operating system and being programmed to enable game play of the gaming machine when the first operating system is booted (paragraph 60, 65, 102); a second computing device disposed within the locked enclosure of the gaming machine, the second computing device being configured to run a second operating system and, when the second operating system is booted (paragraph 132), to receive game software components directly from an other gaming machine over a network (Fig. 13), and a mass storage device within the locked enclosure, the mass storage being accessible by the first and the second computing devices; wherein the second computing device is configured to receive a package (paragraph 14) authenticated by a code signing directly from the other gaming machine over the network only when booted under the second operating system, the package including the software components to be installed on the mass storage device, and wherein the first computing device is configured to execute the unpacked software components only when booted under the first operating system (paragraph 15, claims 71, 73 and 76).

Regarding claim 34, Gatto et al disclose the second computing device is further configured to verify the code signing and to unpack the software components included in the package when booted under the second operating system (Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 35, Gatto et al disclose the first and second computing devices are configured such that only one of the first and second computing devices can be booted at any given time (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 36, Gatto et al disclose the first computing device is configured to be uncoupled from the network when the first computing device is booted under the first operating system (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 37, Gatto et al disclose the first operating system is one of Linux, an embedded commercial operating system and a proprietary operating system (paragraph 131).

Regarding claim 38, Gatto et al disclose the second operating system is one of Microsoft Windows® and a commercial operating system capable of secure network communication and of enforcing policies via built-in or third party add-in functionalities (paragraph 131).

Regarding claim 39, Gatto et al disclose the first computing device is non PC based (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 40, Gatto et al disclose the first computing device is a PC based gaming machine that is not capable of securely receiving game software components over the network (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 41, Gatto et al disclose the first computing device is a PC based computing device not running a version of the Microsoft Windows® operating system (paragraph 131).

Regarding claim 42, Gatto et al disclose the second computing device includes a PC (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 43, Gatto et al disclose the second computing device runs a version of the Microsoft Windows® operating system (paragraph 131).

Regarding claim 44, Gatto et al disclose receiving a package is carried-out in a peer-to-peer fashion or a daisy chain fashion (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 45, Gatto et al disclose receiving a package uses a network file copy (Figs. 8, 10, and 13).

Regarding claim 46, Gatto et al disclose the verifying of the code signing is done under software restriction policy or equivalent centrally federated enforcement infrastructure for enabling the execution of authorized software in network nodes using certificate rules, hash rules and/or path rules (Fig. 16).

Regarding claim 47, Gatto et al disclose the verifying of the code signing is followed by aborting if the package code signing is invalid (Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 48, Gatto et al disclose including sending a selected package stored on the PC directly to the PC of another gaming machine (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 49, Gatto et al disclose the sending is done in a peer-to-peer fashion or in a daisy-chain fashion (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

(Continued in next Supplemental Box)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US08/12043

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

Previous Supplemental Box

Regarding claim 50, Gatto et al disclose a method for downloading software components over a network to a first gaming machine controlled by a first computing device (Abstract, paragraphs 7 and 13), the first gaming machine being disposed within a locked enclosure (paragraph 58) a second gaming machine being coupled to the network, the method comprising the steps of: providing a second computing device within the locked enclosure of the first gaming machine (paragraph 132); connecting the second computing device to the second gaming machine over the network (Fig. 13); providing an interface between the second computing device and the first computing device; downloading a package (paragraph 14) authenticated (Fig. 4) by a code signing directly from the second gaming machine over the network, the package including software components to be installed and executed on the first computing device, the software components not being compatible with the second computing device; verifying the code signing and unpacking the software components included in the package (Fig. 8), and enabling the first computing device to execute the unpacked software components (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 51, Gatto et al disclose the downloading step is carried out with the software components not being executable by the second computing device (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 52, Gatto et al disclose the first providing step is carried out such that the second computing device runs a version of the Microsoft Windows® operating system (paragraph 131).

Regarding claim 53, Gatto et al disclose the first providing step is carried out with the second computing device including a PC (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 54, Gatto et al disclose the package downloading step is carried out with the software components being authorized by a regulatory authority (paragraphs 122, 129).

Regarding claim 55, Gatto et al disclose the package includes a Microsoft MSI package or equivalent package (Fig. 12, paragraphs 14 and 15).

Regarding claim 56, Gatto et al disclose the second providing step is carried out such that the interface includes an Application Program Interface (API) (paragraph 56).

Regarding claim 57, Gatto et al disclose the verifying step includes one of issuing a verification command and a step of rebooting the second computing device (paragraphs 60, 65, 102).

Regarding claim 58, Gatto et al disclose the step of rebooting the second computing device and verifying the code signing of any package stored in a local memory of the second computing device upon reboot (paragraphs 60, 65, 102).

Regarding claim 59, Gatto et al disclose downloading a package is carried out in a peer-to-peer fashion or a daisy chain fashion (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 60, Gatto et al disclose downloading a package uses a network file copy (Figs. 8, 10, and 13).

Regarding claim 61, Gatto et al disclose the verifying of the code signing is followed by aborting of the method if the package code signing is invalid (Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 62, Gatto et al disclose a step of sending a selected package stored on the second computing device directly to a selected gaming machine over the network (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 63, Gatto et al disclose the sending is done in a peer-to-peer fashion or in a daisy-chain fashion (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 64, Gatto et al disclose the verifying of the code signing is performed using software restriction policy or equivalent centrally federated enforcement infrastructure for enabling the execution of authorized software in network nodes using certificate rules, hash rules and path rules (Fig. 16).

(Continued in next Supplemental Box)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US06/12043

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

Previous Supplemental Box

Regarding claim 65, Gatto et al disclose a method for downloading software components to a PC based gaming machine over a network to which a plurality of other gaming machines are coupled (Abstract, Fig. 10), the PC based gaming machine including a persistent data storage (paragraphs 53, 54, 72), the method comprising the steps of: configuring the PC based gaming machine with a dual-boot capability including a first operating system and a second operating system (paragraph 132), the persistent storage being accessible by the first operating system and by the second operating system; executing the game software when the first operating system is booted; connecting the PC to the network when the second operating system is booted; downloading a package (paragraph 14) authenticated by a code signing to the PC based gaming machine directly from one of the other gaming machines coupled to the network only when booted under the second operating system (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130), the package including the software components to be installed on the persistent data storage; verifying the code signing and unpacking the software components included in the package when booted under the second operating system (Fig. 8), and enabling the PC based gaming machine when booted under the first operating system to execute the unpacked software components (paragraph 132). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common

Regarding claim 66, Gatto et al disclose the first operating system is a selected one of Linux, an embedded commercial operating system and a proprietary operating system (paragraph 131).

Regarding claim 67, Gatto et al disclose the second operating system is a selected one of Microsoft Windows, a commercial operating system capable of secure network communication by enforcing policies by enforcing policies via build-in or third party add-in functionalities (paragraph 131).

Regarding claim 68, Gatto et al disclose each of the first and second operating systems is capable of requesting a reboot under the first or second operating systems (paragraphs 60, 65, 102).

Regarding claim 69, Gatto et al disclose the software components are authorized by a regulatory authority (paragraphs 122, 129).

Regarding claim 70, Gatto et al disclose the package is a Microsoft MSI package (Fig. 11).

Regarding claim 71, Gatto et al disclose the package is equivalent to a Microsoft MSI package (Fig. 12, paragraphs 14 and 15).

Regarding claim 72, Gatto et al disclose downloading a package is carried-out in a peer-to-peer fashion or a daisy chain fashion (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 73, Gatto et al disclose downloading a package uses a network file copy (Figs. 8, 10, and 13).

Regarding claim 74, Gatto et al disclose the verifying of the code signing is followed by aborting of the method if the package code signing is invalid (Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 75, Gatto et al disclose a step of sending a selected package stored on the PC directly to the PC of another gaming machine (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 76, Gatto et al disclose the sending is done in a peer-to-peer fashion or in a daisy-chain fashion (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 77, Gatto et al disclose the verifying of the code signing is performed using software restriction policy or equivalent centrally federated enforcement infrastructure for enabling the execution of authorized software in network nodes using certificate rules, hash rules and path rules (Fig. 16).

Regarding claim 78, Gatto et al disclose a network of gaming machines (Abstract, Fig. 10), comprising: a network; a first gaming machine including a first locked enclosure (paragraph 58), a first computing device disposed within the first locked enclosure for controlling game play on the first gaming machine, a first download-enabled computing device that is configured to selectively couple to the network and disposed within the first locked enclosure (Fig. 8), and a second gaming machine; wherein the first download enabled computing device is configured to couple to the second gaming machine over the network and to download a package (paragraph 14) authenticated by a code signing directly from the second gaming machine, the package including software components to be installed and executed on the first computing device (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 79, Gatto et al disclose the first download enabled device is further configured to verify the code signing, to unpack the software components included in the package, and to store the unpacked software components in a first mass storage device (Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 80, Gatto et al disclose wherein the first computing device is further configured to execute the unpacked software components (paragraph 132).

(Continued in next Supplemental Box)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/ISA06/12043

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

Previous Supplemental Box

Regarding claim 81, Gatto et al disclose the second gaming machine includes a second locked enclosure, a second computing device disposed within the second locked enclosure for controlling game play on the second gaming machine, and a second download-enabled computing device that is configured to be selectively coupled to the network and disposed within the second locked enclosure and wherein the first download enabled computing device is configured to couple to the second download-enabled computing device over the network to download the package (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 82, Gatto et al disclose the software components are not executable by the first download-enabled computing device (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 83, Gatto et al disclose the unpacked software components are not executable by the second download-enabled computing device (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 84, Gatto et al disclose the second download enabled computing device is configured to couple to the first download enabled device over the network and to download a package authenticated by a code signing (Fig. 4) directly from the first download-enabled device, the package including software components to be installed and executed on the second computing device (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 85, Gatto et al disclose the second gaming machine is configured to couple to the first download enabled device over the network and to download a package authenticated by a code signing (Fig. 4) directly from the first download-enabled device, the package including software components to be installed and executed on the second gaming machine (paragraph 132).

Regarding claim 86, Gatto et al disclose downloading a package is carried-out in a peer-to-peer fashion or a daisy chain fashion (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130). It is noted that since the fetch list is compiled without central system and since the terminal are on a LAN, game fetch list can be sent and fulfilled by other terminals on a LAN in peer-to-peer fashion as is common on any LAN.

Regarding claim 87, Gatto et al disclose downloading a package uses a network file copy (Figs. 8, 10, and 13).

Regarding claim 88, Gatto et al disclose the verifying of the code signing is performed using software restriction policy or equivalent centrally federated enforcement infrastructure for enabling the execution of authorized software in network nodes using certificate rules, hash rules and path rules (Fig. 16).

Regarding claim 89, Gatto et al disclose the verifying of the code signing is followed by aborting if the package code signing is invalid (Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 90, Gatto et al disclose method of propagating new software components to a plurality of gaming machines coupled to a network (Abstract, Fig. 10), comprising the steps of: broadcasting, from one of the plurality of gaming machines coupled to the network, a package (paragraph 14) authenticated by a code signing (Fig. 4) directly to other ones of the plurality of gaming machines coupled to the network (paragraphs 62, 113, 118, 123, 130), the package including the new software components to be installed and executed on the other ones of the plurality of gaming machines coupled to the network (Fig. 11), at each of the gaming machines to which the package was broadcast, verifying the code signing, unpacking and storing the new software components included in the package, and executing the stored software components (Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 91, Gatto et al disclose the plurality of gaming machines include both PC-based gaming machines and non PC-based gaming machines (Fig. 10, paragraphs 131, 132).

Regarding claim 92, Gatto et al disclose the verifying of the code signing is performed using software restriction policy or equivalent centrally federated enforcement infrastructure for enabling the execution of authorized software in network nodes using certificate rules, hash rules and path rules (Fig. 8).

Regarding claim 93, Gatto et al disclose the verifying of the code signing is followed by aborting of the method if the package code signing is invalid (Fig. 8).

Claims 1-93 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.